

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-16 are presented for examination.
2. The claims and only the claims form the metes and bounds of the invention.
"Office personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969)" (MPEP p 2100-8, c 2, I 45-48; p 2100-9, c 1, I 1-4). The Examiner has full latitude to interpret each claim in the broadest reasonable sense. The Examiner will reference prior art using terminology familiar to one of ordinary skill in the art. Such an approach is broad in concept and can be either explicit or implicit in meaning.

Priority

3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file. The priority date of 23 April 2003 is given.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 18 October, 2005 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Specification

5. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative. The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the

Art Unit: 4171

disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc. This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because those numbers in parentheses refer to different parts of the submitted drawings. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign

Art Unit: 4171

country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-12, 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hosaka (US Pat. No. 5566153).

As to claim 1, Hosaka et al disclose:

A storage device for providing access to a recording medium, said storage device comprising (Hosaka, Figure 1):

- a) interface means for exposing a predetermined portion of the maximum storage capacity of said recording medium, said predetermined portion being addressable for inputting or outputting data across said interface means (Hosaka, column 4, line 32-56);
- and
- b) selecting means for selecting said predetermined portion in response to a selection input (Hosaka, column 2, line 24-43).

As to claim 2, Hosaka disclose:

A device according to claim 1, wherein said selecting means comprises switching means for switching between at least two selection states for selecting at least one of a location and a size of said predetermined portion (Hosaka, column 4, line 32-56).

As to claim 3, Hosaka disclose:

A device according to claim 2, wherein said switching means comprises at least a first switching means for switching between at least two different locations and a second switching means for switching between at least two different sizes (Hosaka, column 4,

Art Unit: 4171

line 32-56) .

As to claim 4, Hosaka disclose:

A device according to claim 2, wherein said switching means comprises a software switch operated by a selection input signal receivable via an input terminal of said storage device (Hosaka, column 4, line 50-56).

As to claim 5, Hosaka disclose:

A device according to claim 2, wherein said switching means comprises a hardware switch arranged on said storage device (Hosaka, column 7, line 9-12).

As to claim 6, Hosaka disclose:

A device according to claim 2, wherein said switching means provides a first selection type defining a first selection state in which said predetermined portion correspond to said maximum storage capacity, a second selection state in which said predetermined portion corresponds to the second half of said maximum storage capacity, a third selection state in which said predetermined portion corresponds to the second quarter of said maximum storage capacity, and a fourth selection state in which said predetermined portion corresponds to the fourth quarter of said maximum storage capacity (Hosaka, column 3, table 1, item ST1, ST2, ST3).

As to claim 7, Hosaka disclose:

A device according to claim 2, wherein said switching means provides a second election type defining a first selection state in which said predetermined portion correspond to

Art Unit: 4171

the first quarter of said maximum storage capacity, a second selection state in which said predetermined portion corresponds to the second quarter of said maximum storage capacity, a third selection state in which said predetermined portion corresponds to the third quarter of said maximum storage capacity, and a fourth selection state in which said predetermined portion corresponds to the fourth quarter of said maximum storage capacity (Hosaka, column 3, table 1, item ST3 or ST4).

As to claim 8, Hosaka disclose:

A device according to claim 2, wherein each selection state can be allocated to a different specific host device to which said storage device is connectable (Hosaka, column 5, line 36-43).

As to claim 9, Hosaka disclose:

A device according to claim 2, wherein said switching means is programmable by a programming signal receivable via an input terminal of said storage device (Hosaka, column 4, line 50-57).

As to claim 10, Hosake disclose:

A device according to claim 1, wherein a configuration of said selecting means is stored on said recording medium (Hosaka, column 6, line 17-20).

As to claim 11, Hosaka disclose:

A device according to claim 10, wherein said recording medium is an optical disc and said configuration is stored in a drive navigation area (DN) of said optical disc (Hosaka,

column 2, line 24-30 and column 6 line 21-24).

As to claim 12, Hosaka disclose:

A device according to claim 1, wherein said storage device is a removable drive device for an optical disc (Hosaka, column 2, line 24-43).

As to claim 15, Hosaka disclose:

A device according to claim 1, wherein a file system area of said recording medium is excluded from said exposed predetermined portion (Hosaka, column 9, line 1-10).

As to claim 16, Hosaka disclose:

A method of reading from or writing to a recording medium, said method comprising the steps of:

- a) providing an access interface function for reading from or writing to said recording medium (Hosaka, column 4, line 32-56);
- b) exposing via said access interface function a predetermined portion of the maximum storage capacity of said recording medium (Hosaka, column 2, line 19-22) ; and
- c) providing an input function for selecting at said access interface function at least one of a size and a location of said predetermined portion (Hosaka, column 2, line 24-43).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or

described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosaka (US Pat.No. 5566153) in view of Armstrong (US Pat. No. 6140936).

Regarding claim 13 and 14, Hosaka teach the optical card recording device has an interface to external unit for selecting partitions of the optical card (Hosaka, column 5, line 36-43). Hosaka failed teach the optical card recording device has a standard storage interface. However, Armstrong teach the memory card device has a standard storage interface such as PCMCIA interface (Armstrong, column 9, line 3-9).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the Art to add an standard storage interface such as PCMCIA to an optical card recording device as described by Hosaka (column 5, line 36-43) so that it can be quickly connected to a desktop, a laptop or a palmtop computer (Armstrong, column 9, line 3-9).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John D. Pham whose telephone number is 571-270-

Art Unit: 4171

1590. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00AM - 5:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ramesh Patel can be reached on 571-272-3688. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

John Pham
November 26, 2007

/John D. Pham/
Examiner, Art Unit 4171

/Ramesh B. Patel/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4171

